REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claim 1-50 were pending in the application. By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 6, 10, 17, 22, 28, 38, 40, 45 and 47 are amended, and claim 51 is added. No new matter is presented.

In numbered paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 38-44 under 35 U.S.C. §101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. To address the Examiner's concerns, these claims are amended. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

In numbered paragraph 5 on pages 3-6 of the Office Action, independent claims 1, 17, 38 and 45 as well as various dependent claims are rejected as being anticipated by Plow et al. (U.S. Patent 6,806,892). In numbered paragraph 7 on pages 6-9, dependent claims 11-15, 30, 32-33, 35-37, 43-44 and 50 are rejected as being unpatentable over the Plow publication. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant has disclosed a method and system for exchanging information with a process using a window display port. As variously exemplified in Figures 1-6, information related to a first process is presented in a window that is resizable within a presentation space of a monitor. For example, as illustrated in Figure 2, a window 108, which is resizable within the presentation space 106, information related to a first process - process 1 - is presented. A second process - process 2 - is selected and a display port 118 is opened in a portion of the window 108. Information related to the second process is presented in the display port 118. The display port is linked to the window within the presentation space of the monitor. Thus, the display port is

linked to the window presenting information related to the first process and the display port presents information related to the second process.

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed by claims 1, 17, 38 and 45, which recite, among other features, a method for exchanging information with a process using a window display port, the method comprising: presenting information related to a first process in a window that is resizable within a presentation space of a monitor; selecting a second process; opening a display port in a portion of the window; presenting information related to the second process in the display port; and linking the display port to the window within the presentation space of the monitor while presenting the information related to the second process in the display port, wherein the first and second processes are separate processes.

The Plow publication does not disclose at least the feature of linking the display port to the window within the presentation space of the monitor while presenting the information related to the second process in the display port. As recited, the display port presents information related to the second process and is linked to the window which presents information related to the first process.

The Examiner alleges at page 3 of the Office Action that column 3, lines 40-42 of the Plow publication discloses this linking feature. The relied upon portion merely indicates that an application viewport, alleged to be equivalent to the display port as recited, is associated with a primary application window by default when the viewport is first created. Thus, the Plow publication discloses that both the application viewport and the primary application window, to which the viewport is associated, display information regarding the same process associated with the primary application window. The Plow publication does not disclose the feature of linking the

display port to the window while presenting the information related to the second process in the display port as recited.

The Plow publication does disclose that a user may decide to see a previously hidden application window and selects the application viewport so that the information presented in the hidden window is displayed in the viewport. As illustrated in Figure 7, when the user selects an application icon of interest from the task bar with a right mouse click (step 204), the selected application is associated with the application viewport (step 206). When this occurs, the application viewport is no longer associated with the primary application window. This is further evidence that the Plow publication does not disclose the feature of linking the display port to the window, which presents information related to the first process, while presenting information related to the second process in the display port. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Plow publication does not anticipate claims 1, 17, 38 and 45.

Dependent claims 2-9, 18-23, 39-42 and 46-49 depend from independent claims 1, 17, 38 and 45, and thus are also not anticipated by the Plow publication. In addition, the features of these dependent claims are independently distinguishable over the Plow publication. For example, claims 2-5 recite associating an input focus with the display port, wherein the second process can receive information from the user interface. In Plow, the application viewport serves only to display information that is already present in a selected associated hidden window. There is no disclosure in the Plow publication that the viewport itself can be used to receive input. Thus, the Plow publication does not disclose associating the input focus with

the display port, wherein the second process can receive information from the user interface as recited.

Claim 6 recites swapping the information presented in the display port with the information presented in the window such that the information related to the first process is presented in the display port and the information related to the second process is presented in the window. The Examiner alleges at page 4 of the Office Action that the Plow publication inherently discloses swapping information and refers to column 3, lines 34-48. The Plow publication discloses that the application viewport is merely used to display information that is already presented within one of the hidden windows. The association of the application viewport may be changed from the primary application window to one of many hidden windows, but the information presented within the primary or the hidden window do not change as illustrated in Figure 7. Thus, the Plow publication does not disclose the feature of swapping the information as recited.

Claim 10 recites closing the display port and halting an execution of the second process when the display port is closed. The element 106 in Figure 4 of the Plow publication is described as a closed button. *See column 3, lines 62-63.* Activating this button merely closes the application viewport. The Plow publication does not disclose that the underlying window is halted.

For similar reasons, the dependent claims 18-23, 39-42 and 46-49 are similarly independently distinguishable over the Plow publication. Applicant respectfully submits that the Plow publication does not anticipate claims 1-10, 17-23, 38-42 and 45-49.

Claims 11-15, 30, 32-33, 35-37, 43-44 and 50 depend from independent claims 1, 17, 38 and 45. Thus, the claims would not have been obvious in view of the Plow publication.

Also, the Plow publication would not have taught or suggested the individual features of these dependent claims. Claim 11 recites closing the display port while maintaining an execution of the second process when closing the window an execution of the first process, an opening a second window within the presentation space and presenting the information related to the second process in the second window. The Examiner admits that these features are not present in the Plow publication, but alleges that it would have been obvious to open a second window to present the information.

The Plow publication discloses using the application viewport to display information in one of the hidden windows that is already present in the desktop. When the viewport is closed, there is no need to create another window to display the same information that is already present in one of the hidden windows. Thus, the Plow publication would not have taught or suggested the features of claim 11.

Claim 12 recites that a list of selected processes as selectable entries are included in a drop-down menu associated with the window. The Plow publication describes that applications may be selected from a task bar. A task bar is not associated with a specific window that is presenting information related to a specific process. The Plow publication would not have suggested that a window, which is associated a particular process, be included with a menu item to select other processes.

Claim 14 recites resizing the display port in an amount proportional to an amount the window changes when the window is resized, and claim 15 recites maintaining a relative positioning of the display port within the window when repositioning the window within the presentation space. The Plow publication expressly teaches that the application window is simply another window that is independently resizable and movable. *See column 4, lines 51-55.* This teaches away from linking the display port to the windows as recited in claims 14 and 15.

Claims 30, 32-33, 35-37, 43-44 and 50 are similarly independently distinguishable over Plow. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11-15, 30, 32-33, 35-37, 43-44 and 50 would not have been obvious in view of the Plow publication.

The new claim 51, which depends from claim 13, is supported by the disclosure as originally submitted on at least paragraph 21. The Plow publication does not disclose this feature.

At least for the foregoing reasons, Applicant's claims 1-51 are allowable. As such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 11, 2007

By: _____
for Patrick G. Keane
Registration No. 32858

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620